

Remarks/Arguments

Reconsideration of this application is requested.

Claim Status

Claims 1-21 are pending in this application. Since no claims are canceled, amended or added, no listing of claims is required under 37 CFR 1.121.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §102(e)

Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Momose et al. (US 5,959,742) in view of Naito et al. (US 6,628,417). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections. The key feature of the present invention is selecting the best paper cassette by making two separate cassette selections with reference to two memory tables, and then comparing the selected cassettes according to a predetermined criterion and making an ultimate cassette selection. Accordingly, each of independent claims 1, 11 and 21 requires the following steps:

1. *Selecting a first paper cassette according to the highest priority print type, as determined by reference to a first memory table.* This step is best understood with reference to paragraph [0120] and Figs. 6A-B. The image forming apparatus has a number of paper cassettes such as, for example, three paper cassettes 51-53. Each paper cassette has a corresponding print type. All potential print types are prioritized in the first memory table. The print types in the first memory table may be prioritized, for example, by 100% magnification preferred (Fig. 6A), or by one page preferred (Fig. 6B). Thus, in step 1, the controller selects the paper cassette with the highest priority print type as determined by reference to the first memory table. For example, if cassette 1 has print type “semi-just-1-page”, cassette 2 has print type “long-page”, and cassette 3 has print type “semi-just-half-page”, and the apparatus is in 100% magnification preferred mode, “semi-just-half-page” has highest priority and cassette 3 is therefore selected as the first cassette in the first step.

2. *Selecting a second paper cassette having a comparative print type corresponding to the print type selected in step 1, as determined by reference to a second memory table.* This step is best understood with reference to paragraph [0130] and Fig. 7. The second memory table T illustrated in Fig. 7 includes a list of comparative print types corresponding to the print types in the first memory table. Thus, in step 2, the controller selects the paper cassette having a comparative print type corresponding to the tentative print type selected in step 1. Continuing the example above, cassette 3 with print type "semi-just-half-page" was selected in step 1. In step 2, the controller references second memory table T and determines that "semi-just-half-page" has a corresponding comparative print type "semi-just-1-page". Since cassette 1 has this print type, cassette 1 is selected as the second cassette in step 2.
3. *Selecting either the first or second cassette based on a predetermined criterion as the ultimate cassette.* Thus, the cassettes selected in steps 1 and 2 are compared based on a predetermined criterion, and the ultimate cassette is selected. For example, as described in paragraph [0141], the predetermined criterion may be smallest sheet size. Continuing the example above, if the second cassette (cassette 1) has a smaller sheet size than the first cassette (cassette 3), then the second cassette (cassette 1) is selected as the ultimate cassette.

This inventive method and apparatus for selecting the best paper cassette for printing is not disclosed or suggested by any of the art of record. Nowhere in the cited art is there a disclosure or suggestion of making two separate cassette selections, according to two separate memory tables, and then comparing the selected cassettes and selecting one according to a predetermined criterion.

Momose discloses a facsimile apparatus capable of selecting a paper cassette based on the image size and a priority order of the cassettes. Although Momose

discloses a priority table for cassette selection, the Action acknowledges that Momose fails to disclose or suggest a *second table* for memorizing a plurality of comparative print types which are to be compared with the plurality of print types in the priority table as required by independent claims 1, 11 and 21. Moreover, Momose makes one and only one cassette selection, which is by default the ultimate cassette selection. Momose does not teach or suggest applicant's inventive concept of making another cassette selection according to another table, and then comparing the two cassettes and making an ultimate selection.

Naito does not remedy the deficiencies of Momose in this regard. The cited passages of Naito have no relevance to applicant's claimed invention. Column 15, line 29 to column 16, line 24 of Naito discloses a "Print Image Size Calculation Table" that is used to calculate the size of a print image that is printed. The table is illustrated in Fig. 38 and includes a printer type field 3801, an output paper type field 3802, a printer resolution field 3803 and a correction coefficient field 3804. As discussed at column 16, lines 7-13, the optimal number of pixels of a print image is calculated based on the contents of the fields of this table. There is no teaching that a paper cassette is selected by reference to this table, much less any teaching that two paper cassettes are selected and compared by referencing two tables, and then making an ultimate selection using a predetermined criterion.

The second cited passage of Naito, column 23, lines 12-47, discloses a "server management table" that is used to manage the connected printers, paper types and paper sizes within the served network, and is similarly unrelated to making two separate cassette selections using two memory tables, and then making an ultimate selection using a predetermined criterion.

With reference to these two passages of Naito, the Action states at page 3: "Naito discloses data communications apparatus that includes a second table for memorizing a plurality of comparative print types which are compared with the plurality of print types in the priority table." Applicant finds no such teaching in

Appl. No. 09/837,713
Amdt. dated September 20, 2005
Reply to Office Action of June 27, 2005

Atty. Ref. 81800.0154
Customer No. 26021

Naito and strongly disagrees with this assertion, and respectfully requests further explanation by the Examiner as to where such a teaching is found.

For these reasons, claims 1-21 are not obvious over Momose in view of Naito. The rejections of claims 1-21 under 35 USC 103(a) should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

This application is believed to be in condition for allowance. The examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned to resolve any issues that remain after entry of this amendment. Any fees due with this response may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,
HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

Date: September 20, 2005

By:

Troy M. Schmelzer
Registration No.36,667
Attorney for Applicant(s)

500 South Grand Avenue, Suite 1900
Los Angeles, California 90071
Phone: 213-337-6700
Fax: 213-337-6701